Thomas E. Duckworth (SBN 152369) Tom@dplolaw.com Monique Olivier (SBN 190385) Monique@dplolaw.com DUCKWÖRTH PETERS LEBOWITZ OLIVIER LLP 100 Bush Street, Suite 1800 San Francisco, California 94104 Telephone: (415) 433-0333 Facsimile: (415) 449-6556 James E. Miller (SBN 262553) imiller@sfmslaw.com Karen M. Leser-Grenon (SBN 231189) kleser@sfmslaw.com SHEPHERD, FINKELMAN, MILLER & SHAH, LLP 65 Main Street Chester, Connecticut 06412 10 Telephone: (860) 526-1100 Facsimile: (866) 300-7367 11 Attorneys for Plaintiff Bennett Vinson and the Proposed Class 12 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA-EASTERN DIVISION 14 15 EDCV14-00369 DDP 16 BENNETT VINSON, on behalf of himself 17 **CLASS ACTION** and all others similarly situated, 18 Case No. Plaintiff, COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND 19 v. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF (1) Breach of Contract 20 (2) Breach of Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing 21 ASSET MANAGEMENT SPECIALISTS, (3) Willful Misclassification of Independent Contractor Status 22 INC. and DOES 1-25, (4) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages 23 (5) Failure to Pay Wages for Hours Defendants. Worked 24 (6) Failure to Indemnify (7) Violations of the Unfair Competition 25 Law 26 JURY DEMANDED 27

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

NATURE OF CLAIM

- 1. Plaintiff Bennett Vinson (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff") brings this action on behalf of himself and a proposed class of similarly situated individuals against Defendant Asset Management Specialists, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as "AMS"), for its unlawful employment scheme that denies Plaintiff and others like him the wages and benefits to which he is lawfully entitled.
- 2. Plaintiff and proposed Class members are employees who have worked for AMS, doing property preservation work in the State of California. Plaintiff, along with others similarly situated, was and continues to be unlawfully treated as independent contractors by AMS. AMS retains control over their work in order to deny Plaintiff and others similarly situated wages and benefits to which they are lawfully entitled under California labor law.
- 3. Through this action, Plaintiff charges AMS with violations of provisions of the California Labor Code and the California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (hereinafter "Wage Orders"). Plaintiff seeks, on behalf of himself and the proposed class, declaratory and injunctive relief, restitution, compensatory damages, liquidated damages, penalties, attorneys' fees and costs, and prejudgment interest.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff Bennett Vinson is an individual resident of Victorville, California who has performed work as a vendor for AMS at various properties in San Bernardino, California.
- 5. Defendant Asset Management Specialists, Inc. is a company headquartered in Bristol, Pennsylvania. AMS provides property preservation, maintenance, repair and rehabilitation, and remodeling services to various foreclosed properties throughout the United States, including California.
- 6. Plaintiff sues fictitious defendants DOES 1-25 because their names and/or capacities and/or facts showing them to be liable are not known presently. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that their entities and/or capacities shall be ascertained through discovery. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this complaint to show their true names and capacities when the same has been ascertained. On information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that each defendant

designated herein as fictitious defendants were in some manner responsible for the occurrences and damages alleged herein.

- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the defendants herein, including those fictitiously named, were at all times relevant to this action, the agent, employer, partner, supervisor, director, joint employer, managing agent, joint venturer, alter ego or part of an integrated enterprise of the remaining defendants and each were acting within the course and scope of that relationship. Plaintiff sues defendants on their own right and on the basis of *respondeat superior*.
- 8. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the defendants herein gave consent to, ratified and authorized the acts alleged herein to each of the remaining defendants, including those fictitiously named defendants.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 9. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332.
- 10. This District is the proper venue for this action as a substantial part, if not all, of the events giving rise to this action has occurred in this District.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. In August 2012, Plaintiff began his employment with AMS. Plaintiff is classified as an independent contractor but treated as an employee from the first day of work until the present. At AMS, Plaintiff is responsible for providing property preservation services for Victorville and San Bernardino County.
- 12. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff, as with other Class members, is not a licensed general contractor, nevertheless, AMS pays Plaintiff as an independent contractor.
- 13. Notwithstanding AMS misclassified Plaintiff and others as independent contractors, Plaintiff, along with other Class members, is an AMS employee in that AMS directly and indirectly controls all aspects of Plaintiff and Class members' employment. AMS handles every detail of the relationship with Plaintiff and other Class members, which allows

12

15

16

20

21

24

25

27

28

AMS to manage properties through these misclassified independent contractors, known as vendors. Through technology and expertise, AMS scrutinizes every work order from placement to completion. AMS measures each vendor's work on every step of every job.

- 14. AMS assigns Plaintiff, along with other Class members, work orders through its own website which vendors log on with an individual access code. AMS assigns work orders seven days a week and requires Plaintiff and other Class members to complete work orders within times prescribed by AMS.
- 15. Upon assigning work orders, AMS controls and manages the completion of the work order. As with other Class members, Plaintiff must sign in to each property as an AMS representative and his work is constantly rated by a scorecard. Failure to maintain a satisfactory rating causes a reduction in work for the Plaintiff and the other class member vendors.
- 16. All work orders Plaintiff and other Class members accept require them to follow 13 detailed protocols and procedures. Work orders are also detailed and include specific requirements regarding the work to be performed. AMS also obligates Plaintiff to additional requirements and information, even if not in the initial work order.
 - 17. Through work orders, Plaintiff and other Class members perform property preservation work, which includes board-ups, trash-outs, janitorial and maid service, winterization, lawn service and other services, as required. AMS also requires Plaintiff and other Class members to remove significant amounts of debris from the properties.
 - At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiff and other Class members work almost 18. exclusively for AMS. As with other Class members, it is virtually impossible for Plaintiff to work for other companies because of the amount of work orders, specific requirements, and time constraints placed upon Plaintiff by AMS. Plaintiff personally performs services and also hires other employees to keep up with the AMS work orders.
 - 19. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiff and other Class members are required to take and submit photos of their work. As with other Class members, AMS requires Plaintiff to

11

12

14

15

18

19

21

23

24

28

take before, during, and after photos. During photos, also known as action photos, are required by AMS to ensure work orders were completed properly.

- 20. At all times relevant to this action, AMS conducts audits and on-site inspections of Plaintiff's and other Class members' work orders. Through inspections, AMS maintains aggressive control of each work order completed by Plaintiff and other Class members. As a result of these inspections, AMS refused to pay Plaintiff and other Class members anything for work performed for allegedly "deficient" work, even when Plaintiff has substantially complied with the work order. AMS regularly and unilaterally reduces Plaintiff's and other Class members' invoices by 20% or more. Plaintiff and other Class members are also required to cure any deficiencies with any work orders and any additional, discretionary requirements of AMS without pay.
- 21. At all times relevant to this action, AMS refused to pay Plaintiff and other Class members for work performed based on subjective criteria used during AMS inspections of their work.
- 22. At all time relevant to this action, Plaintiff and other Class members were required to participate in mandatory training conducted by AMS. Training included video and in-person training. AMS forced Plaintiff and other Class members to attend these trainings and did not pay them for any of their time and expenses related to such trainings.
- 23. During the course of their employment, Plaintiff and other Class members were paid either by price rate for each task, or a flat rate for the entire work order, which was determined by AMS. Payment on work orders was usually made 45 to 60 days after completion and submission of the work order. AMS determined price rates and/or flat rates for each work order.
- 24. As with other Class members, Plaintiff incurred various necessary and reasonable business expenses related to his employment with AMS. Plaintiff incurred expenses, including, but not limited to: trucks, trailers, gas, mileage, car repair, computers, phones, monthly mobile internet services, dumping, and other materials for the various properties managed by AMS.

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

AMS did not reimburse Plaintiff or other Class members for these out-of-pocket expenses directly related to their employment, and other expenses incurred in the course of performing their work.

- 25. Plaintiff and other Class members regularly worked more than 8 hours a day and 40 hours a week working for AMS. Plaintiff and other Class members were never paid overtime for any time they worked beyond the 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week. For example, Plaintiff worked early mornings to prepare and process work orders, and worked until late night to upload photos for work performed that day.
- 26. Plaintiff and other Class members are informed, believe and thereon allege that AMS was at all times aware Plaintiff and Class members work overtime, but refused to pay any overtime pay.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

27. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other persons similarly situated. The proposed class (hereinafter the "Class") that Plaintiff seeks to represent is defined as follows:

All persons who have performed property preservation and maintenance services for AMS at any property within the State of California for four years prior to the filing of the original complaint in this action through the date of final judgment.

- 28. This action may properly be maintained as a class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and (b) (3) and/or (c) (4).
- 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that the Class is comprised of more than 50 persons, and is so numerous that joinder of all members would be impracticable. The exact size of the Class and the identity of the members of the Class is ascertainable from the business records of AMS.
- 30. Questions of law and fact common to the Class exist that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including, *inter alia*, the following:

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

27

28

- Whether AMS breached its contract and its covenant of good faith and fair dealing with Plaintiff and members of the Class;
- b. Whether AMS has a policy or practice of misclassifying members of the Class as independent contractors rather than employees in order to avoid compliance with various provisions of the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (hereinafter, "Wage Orders");
- Whether AMS has paid all Class members for the hours that were worked in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week as required by California law;
- d. Whether AMS's pay practices toward members of the Class comply with the requirements of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Order(s);
- Whether AMS's business practices are unlawful and/or unfair in violation of the Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq. ("UCL").
- 31. The claims asserted by Plaintiff in this action are typical of the claims of the Class, the claims arise from the same course of conduct by AMS, and the relief sought is common.
- Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. 32. Plaintiff has retained counsel who are competent and experienced in consumer protection, employment and class action litigation.
- 33. A class action is superior to other methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Each Class member has suffered injury and is entitled to recover damages by reason of AMS's unlawful conduct. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system. Moreover, the prosecution of separate actions against by individual Class members would create a risk of inconsistent 26 judgments. Finally, there will be no undue difficulty in the management of this litigation as a class action.

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CAUSES OF ACTION FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Contract)

- 34. Plaintiff and Class members incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 33, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 35. Plaintiff and Class members entered into contracts with AMS to perform services for AMS in exchange for payment of those services. These agreements were in writing and governed the respective responsibilities of the parties.
- 36. AMS materially breached Plaintiffs' and other Class members' Agreements when they failed to compensate them as provided for in the Agreements.
- 37. AMS has refused and continues to refuse to allow Plaintiff and Class members the benefits of their employment contract and to perform under said agreement in the agreed-upon manner.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Class members pray for judgment against AMS as hereinafter set forth.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing)

- 38. Plaintiff and Class members incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 37, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 39. As with other Class members, as a result of the employment relationship which existed between Plaintiff and AMS, the express and implied promises made in connection therewith, and the acts, conduct and communications which resulted in said implied promises, AMS covenanted and promised to act in good faith toward and deal fairly with Plaintiff and other Class members, which requires, *inter alia*, the following:
 - (A) Each party in the relationship must act with good faith toward the other concerning all matters related to the employment;
 - (B) Each party in the relationship must act with fairness toward the other concerning all matters related to the employment;

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- (C) Neither party would take any action to prevent the other from obtaining the benefits of the employment relationship; and
- Defendant employer would comply with its own representations, rules, (D) practices, policies and procedures in dealing with Plaintiff.
- 40. AMS breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing and said breach was wrongful, in bad faith, and unfair, and therefore in violation of AMS's legal duties.
- Plaintiff and Class members further allege that AMS breached the covenant of 41. good faith and fair dealing when they:
 - Continually fail and refuse to pay Plaintiff and Class members in (A) accordance with California law;
 - Unfairly prevent Plaintiff and Class members from obtaining the benefits (B) of the employment relationship including pay, overtime, expense reimbursement and other benefits:
- AMS' continued breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing is a 42. 15 substantial factor in causing damage and injury to Plaintiff and Class members. As a direct and proximate result of AMS' unlawful conduct herein alleged, Plaintiff and Class members have lost wages, expenses and other employee benefits in an amount that will be proven at trial. 17

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Class members pray for judgment against Defendants as hereinafter set forth. 19

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Willful Misclassification of Independent Contractor Status Labor Code §§ 226.8, 2753)

- 43. Plaintiff and Class members incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 42, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 44. AMS intentionally and willfully characterized Plaintiff and Class members as independent contractors rather than employees in violation of Labor Code § 226.8. As with Class members, during Plaintiff's employment with AMS, AMS continues to engage in a pattern

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

and practice of intentionally misclassifying employees as independent contractors for its own financial benefit.

45. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to recover the civil penalties specified in Labor Code §§ 226.8 and 2753 all damages proximately caused by AMS's wrongful conduct, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and all Class members pray for judgment against AMS as hereinafter set forth.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation Calif. Labor Code §§510, 1194 and 1198; Cal. Code of Regs. §11090(3) (A))

- 46. Plaintiff and Class members incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 45, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 47. Labor Code §1194 provides that any employee receiving less than the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.
- 48. Labor Code § 510 and Cal. Code of Regs. §11090(3)(A)), require employers to pay employees one-and-one-half (1-1/2) times the regular hourly rate for all those hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one work week and/or in excess of eight (8) in one work day, and two (2) times the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours per day, unless such employees are exempt from the requirements of Wage Order 9.
- 49. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff and the Class members were and continue to be non-exempt employees who did not and do not meet the test for any exemption applicable under California law.
- 50. During the four years following the filing of the Complaint in this case, AMS failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Class members for overtime hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week and double-time hours for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours per day, as required under California law.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

51. As a result of AMS' conduct requiring Plaintiff and the rest of the class to work in excess of eight (8) hours per work day and/or forty (40) in one work week without paying them one-and one-half (1-1/2) times their regular hourly rate (or double-time hours for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours per day) Plaintiff and the class have sustained damages in the amount of one and one-half (1 1/2) times or two (2) times their regular hourly rate for all overtime hours worked, together with interest, attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and all Class members pray for judgment against AMS as hereinafter set forth.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Pay Wages Due and Owing California Labor Code § 200 et seq.)

- 52. Plaintiff and Class members incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 51, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 53. AMS's failure to pay PLAINTIFF and the Class wages due and owing violates the provisions of California Labor Code §200 et seq. AMS has failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse to pay the amounts due.
- 54. In violation of state law, AMS knowingly and willfully refused to perform its obligations to compensate Plaintiff and the class for all wages earned and all hours worked. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the class has suffered, and continues to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages, and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel AMS to fully perform its obligations under state law, all to Plaintiff's and the class members' damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and all Class members pray for judgment against AMS as hereinafter set forth.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Indemnify Employees for Business Expenses Violation of California Labor Code § 2802)

55. Plaintiff and Class members incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 54, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 56. At all times relevant herein, AMS was required by law to indemnify Plaintiff and Class members for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by Plaintiff and Class members pursuant to Labor Code § 2802 and the corresponding California regulations.
- 57. In violation of state law, AMS refused and continues to refuse to perform its obligation to Plaintiff and Class members under Labor Code § 2802. As a direct result, Plaintiff and Class members suffered, and have continued to suffer, losses related to the expenses incurred by their performance of their job, including loss of those expenses, lost interest on those expenses, and attorney's fees in seeking to compel AMS to pay these expenses.
- 58. As a proximate result of AMS's violations of Labor Code §2802, Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to recover their actual damages, interest, and attorneys' fees in amounts according to proof at time of trial.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and all Class members pray for judgment against AMS as 13 hereinafter set forth.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unfair Competition Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200 et seq.)

- 59. Plaintiff and Class members incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 58, inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- The California Unfair Competition Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. 60. ("UCL"), defines unfair competition to include any "unlawful," "unfair," or "fraudulent" business act or practice. Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200.
- Defendants' conduct as described above constitutes unlawful business practices 61. for the reasons set forth below, without limitation:
 - AMS has breached the contract with Plaintiff and the Class; (a)
 - AMS has breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing with the (b) Class;
 - AMS has violated various sections of the California Labor Code, (c) including but not limited to §§ 201, 202 and 203 (requiring payment of all

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

wages due upon termination of employment), 204 (requiring timely bimonthly payment of wages), 510 and 1194 (requiring payment of premium pay for all overtime hours worked) 2802 (requiring indemnification of business expenses); §§ 226.8, and 2753 (requiring correct classification of individuals); and

- AMS has violated various sections of Wage Order 9-2001. (d)
- 62. AMS's conduct as described above constitutes unfair business practices for the reasons set forth below, without limitation:
 - (a) AMS misclassifies Plaintiff and members of the Class as independent contractors (non-employees) and misrepresents and conceals from Plaintiff and members of the Class their status as employees.
 - AMS denies Plaintiff and members of the Class the protections and (b) benefits provided to them under the California Labor Code;
 - AMS has induced and continues to induce Plaintiff and members of the (c) Class to pay thousands of dollars in costs and expenses that should be borne by Defendants;
 - AMS has made implicit and explicit promises to Plaintiff and the Class (d) that they would be paid for the work they performed, but instead were consistently and repeatedly denied such pay;
 - (e) AMS's acts are in direct contravention to Labor Code § 90.5(a) which states that it is the public policy of California to vigorously enforce minimum labor standards in order to ensure employees are not required to work under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect employers who comply with the law from those who attempt to gain competitive advantage at the expense of their workers by failing to comply with minimum labor standards.
- AMS's conduct described above constitutes fraudulent business practices for the 63. reasons set forth below, without limitation:

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- (a) AMS has made and continue to make misrepresentations and omissions of material fact as described above to induce Plaintiff and members of the Class to enter into employment with Defendant, as further described above;
- (b) AMS has made and continue to make misrepresentations and omissions of material fact as described above to induce Plaintiff and members of the Class to continue their working relationship with Defendants as further described above;
- (c) AMS's misrepresentations and omissions are likely to deceive the reasonable individual;
- (d) AMS's misrepresentations are objectively material to the reasonable individual, and therefore reliance upon such representations may be presumed as a matter of law; and
- (e) Plaintiff and members of the Class reasonably and justifiably relied on such misrepresentations.
- 64. As a result of AMS's unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent conduct, Plaintiff and members of the Class suffered injury in fact and lost money and property, including, but not limited to, loss of monies and wages earned.
- 65. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiff and members of the Class seek declaratory and injunctive relief for Defendants' unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent conduct and to recover restitution.
- 66. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, Plaintiff and members of the Class are entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees, costs, and expenses incurred in bringing this action.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and all Class members pray for judgment against AMS as hereinafter set forth.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Class members pray for judgment against AMS, jointly and severally, as follows:

- 1. For declaratory judgment that AMS has violated the California Labor Code and public policy as alleged herein;
- 2. For declaratory judgment that AMS has violated Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq., as a result of the aforementioned violations of the Labor Code and of California public policy protecting wages;
- 3. For preliminary, permanent and mandatory injunctive relief prohibiting AMS. its officers, agents and all those acting in concert with them, from committing in the future those violations of law herein alleged;
- 4. For an equitable accounting to identify, locate and restore to all current and former employees the wages they are due, with interest thereon;
- 5. For an order awarding Plaintiff and the Class compensatory damages, including lost wages, earnings and other employee benefits and all other sums of money owed to Plaintiff and Class members, together with interest on these amounts, according to proof;
- б. For an award of reasonable attorneys' fees as provided by applicable law;
- 7. For all costs of suit; and
- 8. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: February 25, 2014 DUCKWORTH PETERS LEBOWITZ OLIVIER LLP SHEPHERD, FINKELMAN, MILLER & SHAH, LLP

Thomas E. Duckworth

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff and the Class members hereby request a jury trial on all claims so triable.

Dated: February 25, 2014

DUCKWORTH PETERS LEBOWITZ OLIVIER LLP

SHEPHERD, FINKELMAN, MILLER & SHAH, LLP

By:

Thomas E. Duckworth

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Central District of California

Bennet Vinson, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,))					and the second s
Plaintiff(s) v. Asset Management Specialists, Inc. and DOES 1-25,		EICV 1 4 Civil Action No.	(800)	3 (59	DDP (AGRx)
)))					

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Asset Management Specialists, Inc., 311 Sinclair Street, Bristol, Pennsylvania 19007.

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Thomas E. Duckworth (SBN 152369), Monique Olivier (SBN 190385) Duckworth

Peters Lebowitz Olivier, LLP, 100 Bush Street, Suite 1800, San Francisco, CA 94104

(415) 433-0333; and

James E. Miller (SBN 262553), Karen M. Leser-Grenon (SBN 231189, Shepherd, Finkelman, Miller & Shah, LLP, 65 Main Street, Chester, Connecticut 06412, (860)

526-1100.

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

TERRY NAFISI

CLERK OF COURT

Date: 2/26/2014

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (nam	ee of individual and title, if	any)	
was re	eceived by me on (date)		•	
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the in	ndividual at <i>(place)</i>	
			on (date)	; or
	☐ I left the summons a	at the individual's resid	dence or usual place of abode with (name)	
			, a person of suitable age and discretion who re	sides there,
	on (date)	, and mailed a	a copy to the individual's last known address; or	
	☐ I served the summon	ns on (name of individual)		, who is
	designated by law to a	ccept service of proces	ss on behalf of (name of organization)	
			on (date)	; or
	☐ I returned the summ	ons unexecuted becau	se	; or ·
	☐ Other (specify):			
	My fees are \$	for travel and	\$ for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this inf	Formation is true.	
Date:		-	Server's signature	
	·		server s signature	
		-	Printed name and title	
		-	Server's address	

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Opic		11	A
	7		//

VE

	CIVIL	COVER SHEET					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS (Che	eck box if you are representing yourself [])	DEFENDANT	\$ (Check box if you are representing yourself [])				
Bennet Vinson, on behalf of	hlmself and all others similarly situated	Asset Manageme	ent Specialists, Inc. and Does 1-28 10 (50)				
(b) County of Residence	e of First Listed Plaintiff San Bernadino, C	A County of Res	sidence of First Listed Defendant Bristol, PA				
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF	Telephone (1997)				
representing yourself, pro Thomas E. Duckworth (SBN Peters et al., LLP, 100 Bush S 433-0333; James E. Miller (SE	e, Address and Telephone Number) If you are ovide the same information, 152369), Monique Olivier (SBN 190385) Duckworth treet, Suite 1800, San Francisco, CA 94104, (415) SN 262553), Karen M. Leser-Grenon (SBN 231189), in Street, Chester, Connecticut 06412, (860) 526-1100	representing y	m Name, Address and Telephone Number) If you are purself, provide the same information.				
	777461.02	. CITIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPAL PARTIES-For Diversity Cases Only				
		(Place an X in one	box for plaintiff and one for defendant)				
1. U.S. Government Plaintiff	3. Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	tizen of This State	1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 4				
i ignitar		tizen of Another State	2 Z Incorporated and Principal Place 5 X 5				
2. U.S. Government Defendant		tizen or Subject of a reign Country	of Business in Another State 3 3 5 Foreign Nation 6 6				
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X	in and have only)		T MANAGEMENT AND				
1. Original 2.		4. Reinstated or Reopened	5. Transferred from Another District District (Specify) Litigation				
V. REQUESTED IN CON	MPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: 🔀 Yes 🔲	No (Check "Yes	only if demanded in complaint.)				
CLASS ACTION under	F.R.Cv.P. 23; XYes No	MONEY DE	MANDED IN COMPLAINT: \$				
Campurg rapor Code Alolati	VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.) California Labor Code Violations; Breach of Contract; Breach of Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing; Willful Misclassification of Independent Contractor Status; and Violations of the Business and Professions Code (Unfair Competition Law).						
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only).		**************************************				
a double Station State	I PARSOLENCIA SA REGIO DE L'AGONESI	A SANDATGRADIONE	Managara da Angela d				
375 False Claims Act	110 Insurance 240 Torts to Land	462 Naturalization					
400 State Reapportionment	120 Marine 245 Tort Product	Application	463 Alien Detainee 830 Patent				
10 Antitrust	130 Miller Act 290 All Other Real	465 Other Immigration Actio	510 Motions to Vacate				
430 Banks and Banking	140 Negotiable Property		530 General				
450 Commerce/ICC	Instrument 150 Recovery of	370 Other Fraud	535 Death Penalty 861 HIA (1395ff)				
Rates/Etc. 460 Deportation	Overpayment & 310 Airplane	371 Truth in Lendi	over production (322)				
470 Racketeer Influ-	Judgment 315 Airplane Product Liability	380 Other Persona	[] tas a (400 / 400)				
enced & Corrupt Org.	151 Medicare Act 320 Assault, Libel & Slander	Property Damage	555 Prison Condition Constitution				
480 Consumer Credit	152 Recovery of 330 Fed. Employers'	385 Property Dam.	age 560 Civil Detainee				
490 Cable/Sat TV	Loan (Exci. Vet.) Liability 340 Marine		Conditions of Confinement 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or				
☐ 850 Securities/Com- modities/Exchange	153 Recovery of 345 Marine Product	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	Defendant)				
B90 Other Statutory Actions	Vet. Benefits	423 Withdrawal 28	5 Seizure of Property 21 87t IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609				
891 Agricultural Acts	Suits 355 Motor Vehicle	└─ USC 157 Zwy gWJ zilottes	USC 881 690 Other ,				
. 893 Environmental	Product Liability 190 Other 360 Other Personal	440 Other Civil Rig	COCC - 177 -				
Matters 895 Freedom of Info.	Contract Injury	441 Voting	710 Fair Labor Standards				
L Act	☐ 195 Contract ☐ 362 Personal Injury- Product Liability ☐ Med Malpratice	442 Employment	720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations				
896 Arbitration	196 Franchise 365 Personal Injury-Product Liability	443 Housing/ Accommodations	<u> </u>				
899 Admin. Procedures	367 Health Care/	445 American with	740 Railway Labor Act				
Act/Review of Appeal of Agency Decision	Condemnation Personal Injury	Disabilities- Employment	Leave Act				
- 950 Constitutionality of	220 Foreclosure Product Liability 368 Asbestos	☐ 446 American with Disabilities-Other	790 Other Labor Litigation				
State Statutes	230 Rent Lease & Personal Injury Ejectment Product Liability	448 Education	791 Employee Ret. Inc.				
FOR OFFICE MEP AND	Encu	11/1-0	0369 DDP (AGRx)				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Case Number:	COVER SHEET	U D O Y DUP FINITE				

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII. VENUE: Your answers to the questions below will determine the division of the Court to which this case will most likely be initially assigned. This initial assignment is subject to change, in accordance with the Court's General Orders, upon review by the Court of your Complaint or Notice of Removal.

]				
Question A: Was this case removed state court?	from			50.000			3 2 7 4 1 1 1 1 1 1		
Yes 🗷 No		os Angeles	200 D 344 85 - 11 17 4 85			Western			
If "no, " go to Question B. If "yes," chec	k the 🔲 V	entura, Santa Barbara, or San	Luis Obispo			mary production that the same of the same	Western	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to		range		,		Southern			
Question D, below, and skip to Section		iverside or San Bernardino					Eastern		
The second control of					i	***************************************			
Question B: Is the United States, or its agencies or employees, a party to action? Yes X No	FF-77-79-79-70				Constitution of				
		Alemara Brono Degeve Ava		A WAS					
If "no, " go to Question C. If "yes," check box to the right that applies, enter the		os Angeles entura, Santa Barbara, or San	Luis _	Los Ai	ngeles Íra, Santa Barbara, or Sa	in Luis	West		
corresponding division in response to Question D, below, and skip to Section	ж. <u>Ц</u>	bispo		Obisp	i O	,,, Cuis	West	em	
	<u></u>	range		Orang	je 	***************************************	South	ern	
	R	iverside or San Bernardino		Rivers	ide or San Bernardino		Eastern		
		☐ Other		Other			Western		
pile strip to extend or pile strip to the strip of the st	Alige oren	The street by the state of the	9100152				e de esta de la composição		
majority of plaintiffs reside:					☒		<u>Li</u>	<u>Ш</u>	
majority of defendants reside:							X		
Indicate the location in which a majority of claims arose:					×				
C.1. Is either of the following true? I	f so, check th	e one that applies:	C.2. Is eit	her of th	e following true? If s	o, check the	one that applies:		
2 or more answers in Column	n C				e answers in Column D				
only 1 answer in Column C a	nd no answer	s in Column D		only 1 ar	only 1 answer in Column D and no answers in Column C				
Your case will initia		d to the			Your case will initially be assigned to the EASTERN DIVISION.				
Enter "Southern" in resp	IN DIVISIÓN. onse to Quest	ion D, below.	Enter "Eastern" in response to Question D, below.						
If none applies, answer question C2 to the right.					If none applies, go	to the box b	elow.		
		Your case will ! WES Enter "Western" in r	TERN DIVISIO	N.		***************************************	YY 8 3 4 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	60 St. J.	
THE THE PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF CONTROL OF CONTROL OF CONTROL AND ADDRESS OF CONTROL OF	A Marie A Sandanana					THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN NAM		W 3/ W 4000	
Enter the Initial division determined by	Question A.F.	or Cabove		C.		Birth Process			
arter the mida division determined by	-cucation A, E	, or - and	4.		Easteri	n Division		TO SEE S. W.	
CV-71 (11/13)		ĆWII	COVER SHE	FT		<u> </u>	Da	7 A 7 A 7	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

		"100 S O F 200 "100 "100 "100 S 500 S 50 S 200 S 50 L 30		
IX(a). IDENTICAL CA	SES: Has this ac	tion been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed?	X NO	YES
If yes, list case num	ber(s):			
IX(b). RELATED CASE	5: Have any cas	es been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case?	X NO	YES
If yes, list case num	ber(s);			
Civil cases are deemed	related if a previo	usly filed case and the present case;		
(Check all boxes that app	oly) A. Arise	from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or		
·	B. Call fo	or determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact:	or	
	C. For ot	her reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or		
	D. Involv	ve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a,	b or c also is pre	sent,
	The management of the state of			
X. SIGNATURE OF AT (OR SELF-REPRESENT		e E DATE:	2/2	5/14
other papers as required by but is used by the Clerk of the	he Court for the pu	Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement proved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required propose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instruc	directions to I neal	Duta 2 tie nat flind
Key to Statistical codes relat	ring to social secti	ity Cases:		
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action		
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))	Security Act, as a of services unde	mended. Also, r the program.
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part 8, of the Federal Coal Mine Hea. 923)	lth and Safety Ac	t of 1969. (30 U.S.C.
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))	e Social Security	Act, as amended; plus
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))	litle 2 of the Soci	al Security Act, as
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed und amended.	der Title 16 of the	Social Security Act, as
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Se (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))	Curity Act, as am	ended,